

REMARKS

The Office action dated June 21, 2006 has been carefully considered. Claims 1-20 and 26-28 are active in this application. Further examination and reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-20 and 26-28 are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 14, 18, 20 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), second paragraph as anticipated by Adachi is respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the examination of this application, claims 1, 14, 18, and 20 have been amended to recite “data object(s) being capable of different meanings and different values in connection with the receipt of said data object update message”(claims 1, 14, 18) and “updated data being capable of imparting different meanings and different values to at least one data object” (claim 20), e.g., see paragraphs 005and 0036). Adachi is concerned with updating a home location register for tracking mobile phones. Although the register will change based upon mobile phones in the home network, this object, i.e., home location register, will stay the same. The ability to update data objects to impart different meanings can provide a significant advantage since, for instance, access codes can be assigned rather than passwords maintained in an environment requiring access by a large number and ever-changing group of users. Claims 1, 14, 18 and 20 are submitted as being patentably distinct from Adachi. Claims dependent from claims 1, 14, 18 and 20 merely recite limitations in addition thereto and are likewise submitted as patentably distinct from Adachi. Especially in view of the foregoing amendment, it is submitted that Adachi neither teaches nor suggests the invention as now recited in claims 1-4, 6-7, 14, 18, 20 and 26-28. This stands to reason since Adachi is concerned with mobile telephony rather than telematics, a focus of applicants’ invention.

The rejection of claims 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of LaDue is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the foregoing discussed amendment to claim 1 clearly patentably distinguishes claims 5 and 8 over any combination of Adachi with LaDue. LaDue and Adachi taken singly or together fail to teach, suggest or make obvious claims 5 and 8. LaDue like Adachi does not disclose or suggest a “data object being capable of different meanings and different values in connection with the receipt of said data object update message”(claim 1). As such the combination does not yield the attendant

advantage discussed above. LaDue, although concerned with the field of telematics, is primarily focused on mobile telephony aspects such as mobile identification numbers (MINs) (see claim 1 of LaDue). Variably defined data objects are not within its purview.

The rejection of claims 9-10, 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adaci in view of Sakura is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the foregoing discussed amendment to claims 1 and 14 clearly patentably distinguish claims 9-10 and 15, respectively, over any combination of Adachi with Sakura. Sakura, like Adachi, is devoid of any disclosure of “data object(s) being capable of different meanings and different values in connection with the receipt of said data object update message.” Consequently, it is submitted that any combination of Adachi with Sakura fails to teach, suggest or make obvious claims 9-10 and 15.

The rejection of claims 11-13, 16-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adaci in view of Sakura and LaDue is respectfully traversed. These references, taken singly or together, fail to teach, suggest or make obvious the foregoing discussed limitation concerning data objects spelled out with respect to amended claims 1, 14, 18 and 20. By virtue of their dependency, claims 11-13, 16-17 and 19 are submitted as submitted as patentably distinct from any combination of Adaci, Sakura or LaDue.

The rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is submitted as having been overcome by the foregoing amendment to claim 9 which now properly recites dependency from claim 5 rather than claim 4, thereby dispensing with the antecedent basis problems of claims 11 and 12.

**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9-19-06

By: Richard A. Bachand

Richard A. Bachand
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 25,107

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 845-8503
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502